



BRIDGEWATER PLACE • POST OFFICE BOX 352  
GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN 49501-0352  
[WWW.VARNUMLAW.COM](http://WWW.VARNUMLAW.COM)

# CONFIDENTIAL FAX

To: Mrs. Lanford  
1-703-308-3519

Serial No. 618,270

From: DAVID A. RHEM  
[darhem@varnumlaw.com](mailto:darhem@varnumlaw.com)

Phone: 616/336-6629  
Fax: 616/336-7000

Date: June 8, 2004

Pages: 2, including cover page

If you have difficulty receiving this fax, please contact Ruth Ann Kloska at 616/336-6849.

## Comments:

### \*\*\*CONFIDENTIAL\*\*\*

The information contained in this communication may be confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, may constitute inside information, and is intended only for the use of the named recipient. Unauthorized use, disclosure, or copying is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender at 616/336-6000.



BRIDGEWATER PLACE • POST OFFICE BOX 352  
GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN 49501-0352

TELEPHONE 616 / 336-6000 • FAX 616 / 336-7000 • WWW.VARNUMLAW.COM

DAVID A. RHEM

DIRECT DIAL 616/336-6629  
E-MAIL darhem@varnumlaw.com

June 8, 2004

Mrs. Lanford  
Commissioner for Patents  
P. O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

VIA FACSIMILE  
1-703-308-3519

Re: Attorney Docket No. 65429.81918  
SN. 101618,270

Dear Mrs. Lanford::

I apologize for the confusion over the Revocation of Power of Attorney with New Power of Attorney form.

Our firm's customer number is: 37190. (Varnum Riddering Schmidt & Howlett LLP).

My partner Tom Lockhart's registration number is 29,324. I do not have a registration number, so please use his name and number if you also need a registration number.

Please contact me at (616) 336-6629 if you have any further questions.

Very truly yours,

VARNUM, RIDDERING, SCHMIDT & HOWLETT LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David A. Rhem".

David A. Rhem

DAR:rak

998202\_1

**SUBMISSION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT**

The Examiner has invited the Applicant to submit a proposed amendment to consider during the upcoming telephonic interview scheduled for June 16, 2004 at 1:00 p.m.

The Applicant submits a proposed amendment to Claim 1 below, which the Applicant respectfully submits obviates the Examiner's rejections that are predicated upon 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103. The Examiner's rejection focused on the term phrase "integrally formed" with respect to the thermal barrier. The Examiner alleges that the term "integral;" does not require a unitary one-piece structure.

To that end, the Applicant has amended Claim 1 to recite that the thermal barrier is "integrally adhered to said thermal insert". Support for this amendment can be found throughout the specification, but specifically at page 5, line 24 to page 6, line 11. Clearly, neither Laborde (u.s. Pat. No. 3,925,953) nor Schmidt (U.S. Pat. No. 4,688,366) disclose a thermal barrier integrally adhered to a thermal insert. This is especially so with respect to Schmidt since Schmidt does not even disclose a thermal insert, but rather discloses a "tape receiving surface edge."

The Applicant has made no amendment to Claim 8 since it respectfully appears that the Examiner did not consider Applicant's argument that Schmidt does not disclose a thermal insert.

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT**

1. (Proposed) A thermal break system comprising a first portion and a second portion, a thermal insert interposed between said first and second portions to define a longitudinal channel therebetween, and a thermal barrier integrally adhered to said thermal insert formed within said channel.